

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application.

In reply to the Response filed January 10, 2005, the Examiner has repeated the previous claim rejections. Thus, claims 3 and 7-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over previously-cited Chernock et al. (US 6,229,524) in view of previously-cited Blonstein et al. (US 5,955,988) and previously-cited Ohyama et al. (US 5,751,373). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chernock in view of Blonstein and Ohyama, and further in view of previously-cited Inoue (US 6,496,896).

In the Response filed January 10, 2005, Applicant argued that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Chernock and Blonstein. In the “Response to Arguments,” the Examiner points to col. 2, lines 55-57 of Blonstein and states that the motivation for combining Blonstein with the teachings of Chernock is that the implementation of cursor movement transmitting only the cursor display information allows the accuracy of defining location to be improved. See Office Action, page 6. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s interpretation of the references on this issue.

The cited excerpt of Blonstein states the following: “Another advantage of the present invention is in providing a TV GUI that allows the accuracy of defining an antenna location to be improved.” By contrast, the teachings of Chernock are unrelated to antenna locations. Rather, Chernock relates to a user interface for interaction with supplementary information embedded with a video stream and delivered to a television set in a single transport. Chernock is not concerned with the locations of antennas. Thus, the TV GUI of Blonstein, which allows the

accuracy of defining an antenna location to be improved, is not relevant to the teachings of Chernock. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 3 and 7-11 are allowable over the prior art.

Also, in the Response filed January 10, 2005, Applicant argued that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Ohyama with the teachings of Chernock and Blonstein. In the “Response to Arguments,” the Examiner asserts that the motivation to combine the teachings of the references is that a function of a television receiver can be selected simply and rapidly. Here, the Examiner points to col. 1, lines 61-65 of Ohyama, which states: “It is an object of the present invention to provide a television function selection method, a television receiver and a remote commander for a television receiver wherein a function of a television receiver can be selected simply and rapidly.” Applicant submits that the Examiner’s alleged motivation to combine the teachings of the references is completely unrelated to the teachings of Ohyama, which the Examiner asserts to have been obvious to combine with Chernock and Blonstein. In particular, Ohyama is cited for its teaching of a storage device that is a register. However, Ohyama’s objective of being able to simply and rapidly select a function of a television receiver is unrelated to having a storage device that is a register. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the asserted motivation to combine the references is deficient. Thus, claims 3 and 7-11 are allowable for this reason also.

Claim 6 is allowable, at least because of its dependence from claim 3.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U. S. Application No. 09/840,455

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q62057

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Cameron W. Beddard
Registration No. 46,545

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 8, 2005